



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/873,001	06/01/2001	Richard G. Moore	CDR00007	3124
25537	7590	03/05/2009		
VERIZON PATENT MANAGEMENT GROUP 1320 North Court House Road 9th Floor ARLINGTON, VA 22201-2909			EXAMINER KESACK, DANIEL	
			ART UNIT 3691	PAPER NUMBER
			NOTIFICATION DATE 03/05/2009	DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

patents@verizon.com

<p align="center"><b>Advisory Action</b> <b>Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief</b></p>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/873,001	<b>Applicant(s)</b> MOORE ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Daniel Kesack	<b>Art Unit</b> 3691	

**--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

THE REPLY FILED 08 December 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☐ The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
b) ☒ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

#### AMENDMENTS

3. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because  
(a) ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
(b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).  
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.  
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).  
7. ☐ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☐ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.  
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:  
Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.  
Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.  
Claim(s) rejected: \_\_\_\_\_.  
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

#### AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).  
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).  
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

#### REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☒ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
See Continuation Sheet.  
12. ☐ Note the attached Information *Disclosure Statement*(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.  
13. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

/Hani M. Kazimi/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3691

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Examiner respectfully disagrees that the prior art of record fails to teach the claim language.

With regard to the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, Applicant's arguments are persuasive, and Examiner withdraws the rejection. However, the claims are still rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), and are therefore not in condition for allowance.

Regarding claim 29, Applicant argues that the combination of Domenikos and Anderson fail to teach user account information stored in a user profile, where the user account information identifies the prepaid services of a plurality of the prepaid service providers. Applicant argues that since Anderson related to only a single service provider, there is no teaching of user account information identifying the prepaid services of a plurality of the prepaid service providers transmitted to a "respective user" as claimed. Examiner respectfully disagrees. Since the rejection is based on a combination of references, one can not show non-obviousness by attacking the references individually. Domenikos teaches the framework of a system and method for purchasing services from a plurality of service providers. Domenikos does not teach transmitting account information identifying a plurality of services from a plurality of prepaid service providers. However, as disclosed, Anderson teaches transmitting information identifying a plurality of services from a single service provider. One of ordinary skill in the art would look to other prepaid card systems in order to improve the invention of Domenikos. Anderson teaches that typical prepaid systems lack a centralized access point for viewing information for multiple prepaid accounts, and recognizes the benefits. This is motivation for one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Domenikos to include an interface where a user can view data related to multiple accounts. Domenikos provides that these "multiple accounts" are from a plurality of prepaid service providers. The fact that Anderson is directed to a single service provide does not preclude the combination. The reference teaches a feature which could be used to improve Domenikos in the same way the feature improves Anderson.

Similarly, the rejection of claim 42 argues that since Anderson fails to teach a plurality of services offered by a plurality of service providers, Anderson can not teach, nor can it be combined with a reference to teach a request from a user for information relating to a plurality of prepaid services offered by a plurality of prepaid service providers. Examiner respectfully disagrees. The teachings of Anderson relate to a single service provider. Domenikos teaches that it is advantageous for service providers to be able to offer their services through a centralized channel offering services from multiple service providers (paragraph 4). This motivates one of ordinary skill in the art to modify Anderson to accommodate multiple service providers. Domenikos provides a system for accommodating the sale of prepaid services from a plurality of prepaid service providers. As such, Anderson teaches viewing particulars of a single service provider, and the combination teaches viewing the particulars of multiple service providers.

Regarding claim 49, the combination of Anderson teaches presenting via a web interface a first prepaid service, and a second prepaid service. As cited, Mackenthuss makes up for the deficiencies of Anderson by teaching prepaid services from multiple service providers. Examiner considers multiple prepaid services presented together in a central access point for purchasing, as taught by Anderson, disclosed as a "packaged solution" by Anderson, to be presenting the multiple services as bundled services, as claimed.